

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the applicants regard as their invention. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **March 12, 2004**.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC §112, first and second paragraphs, as the claimed invention is not described in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner's grounds of rejection grounds of rejection is traversed for the following reasons. First, there is no supporter recited in claim 2 which is formed on inner periphery of the outer ring. Second, recited in claim 2 the first member mounted on the inner periphery of the inner ring finds support in line 8 of claim 1. Third, recited in claim 2 the second member mounted on the outer periphery of the outer ring finds support in line 9 of claim 1. Therefore, none the elements of claim 2 are contradicted by that provided in claim 1.

Regarding claim 4 the Examiner's grounds of rejection is respectfully traversed since page 16, line 25, through page 17, line 1, of the specification recites,

“Moreover, although a radial ball bearing exemplified the rolling element as an example the bearing in the respective embodiments, the rolling element may also be structured of a cylindrical roller bearing or a needle roller bearing.”

Therefore, the rolling element may also be a roller as recited in claim 4 and therefore the Examiner’s grounds of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 3 and 7 (and claims 2 and 4 to the extent definite) are rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Dickinson.

Dickinson describes a crank bearing, as illustrated in figure 2, having an inner ring (20), an outer ring (21) and a number of antifriction elements (22) sandwiched between the two. In addition, a flange structure (17) is attached to the outer ring (21).

The most distinguishable difference in structure between the present invention as defined in claim 1 and Dickinson is that, in the bearing of claim 1 (the present invention), the inner periphery of the inner ring, the outer periphery of the outer ring and the inner or outer periphery of the supporting part (such as the rotation member face 12c in Fig. 4) are coaxial or concentric with each other, while in Dickinson, the inner periphery of the inner ring 20 is eccentric with the outer periphery of the outer ring and the land 32 of the inner ring 20.

Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art relied upon, by reciting,

“A bearing structure, comprising: an inner ring; an outer ring coaxially disposed on the outer periphery of said inner ring; a rolling element rollably sandwiched between said inner ring and said outer ring; a supporting part integrally formed with and protruding axially from at least one of said inner ring and said outer ring; wherein, said inner ring being capable of supporting a first member on its inner periphery; said outer ring being capable of supporting a second member on its outer periphery in a relatively rotatable manner to said first member; said supporting part being capable of coaxially supporting a third member and also being integrally and coaxially rotatable with said at least one of said inner ring and said outer ring, wherein said supporting part protrudes in a direction of a rotational axis of the bearing structure and is coaxial with a rotational axis of the inner and outer rings, wherein a periphery region to which the third member is being fitted, is concentric with the inner periphery of the inner ring as well as the outer periphery of the outer ring.” (Emphasis Added)

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 7 (and claims 2 and 4 to the extent definite) under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Dickinson is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claim 1, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



George N. Stevens
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,938

GNS/alw
Atty. Docket No. **010617**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE